1	APPEARANCES:	
2	For Del Bunch and Ernestine Bunch:	RICHARD F. HOLLEY, ESQ. Santoro, Driggs, Walch, Kearney,
3		Johnson & Thompson 400 South Fourth Street
4		Third Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
5	For the Debtor:	LENARD E. SCHWARTZER, ESQ.
6		Schwartzer & McPherson Law Firm 2850 South Jones Boulevard
7		Suite 1 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
8 9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
1
           (Court convened at 01:54:11 p.m.)
 2
                THE COURT: Okay. Now, on USA Commercial.
 3
          Appearances, please.
 4
                UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Judge, (indiscernible).
 5
                THE COURT: No. We don't need any.
 6
           (Colloquy not on the record.)
 7
                MR. HOLLEY: Good afternoon, your Honor.
 8
     Richard Holley on behalf of Del and Ernestine Bunch.
 9
                MR. SCHWARTZER: Lenard Schwartzer on behalf of
10
     USA Commercial Mortgage.
                THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead,
11
12
     Mr. Hollev.
13
                MR. HOLLEY: Thank you. Your Honor, first of all,
14
     I would like to thank the Court for entertaining our motion.
15
     I do understand I believe where the process is procedurally
16
     in terms of the Court confirming the plan this morning I
17
     think based upon a cramdown of class A-4.
18
          So, seemingly, this whole thing would be moot, but,
19
     apparently, the debtor's position is as I understand it is
20
     that unless we are willing to withdraw the ballot for voting
2.1
     purposes of the claim that they want to go forward in order
2.2
     to tie down some appeal issues.
23
                THE COURT: And I think that makes sense because
24
     that would leave one more issue which either is or isn't for
25
     an appeal --
```

```
1
               MR. HOLLEY: Yes. And --
 2
               THE COURT: -- depending --
 3
               MR. HOLLEY: And I'm not --
 4
               THE COURT: -- upon --
 5
               MR. HOLLEY: And I'm not --
 6
               THE COURT: -- how I rule.
 7
               MR. HOLLEY: And I'm not disputing that,
 8
     your Honor. I just want to make sure that I'm in proper
 9
     context --
10
               THE COURT: I appreciate that.
               MR. HOLLEY: -- so the Court doesn't feel like
11
     we're up here pestering, you know --
12
13
               THE COURT: No.
14
               MR. HOLLEY: -- the Court --
15
               THE COURT: No. And I appreciate --
16
               MR. HOLLEY: -- because --
17
               THE COURT: Yeah.
18
               MR. HOLLEY: I --
19
               THE COURT: I mean --
20
               MR. HOLLEY: I --
21
                THE COURT: -- I recognize that that's just one
22
     more issue. And if your claim is allowed, then that's the
23
     only issue. If it's not allowed, then that resolves that
24
     issue.
25
               MR. HOLLEY: Exactly. And that's my
```

2.1

```
understanding, your Honor, and, again, we do appreciate the Court taking the time for this.
```

I know that you've had a very taxing at least couple of days if not months, and I do appreciate the Court's willingness to entertain us.

If I could, your Honor, just to set the stage, yesterday afternoon, Mr. Bunch's 2004 examination was taken. And in conjunction with that, there were a number of exhibits that were submitted at the deposition as well as exhibits that we had submitted in support of our motion to allow the claim for voting purposes.

Mr. Bunch is 79 years old. He's in reasonably-good health for his age, but coming down here personally would be rather taxing on him.

And so what we have agreed to do, your Honor, is to submit the transcript which has already been filed with the court as the evidentiary basis upon which we'll go forward.

And then, your Honor, we have also provided the Court with the trial binder which is comprised of all of the exhibits that were attached to the initial motion for allowance and these additional exhibits that were attached to the supplemental declaration of Mr. Bunch and, also, the exhibits that were included in sequence yesterday in the 2004 examination if that makes sense.

So what we end up with, your Honor, are Exhibits A

```
6
```

```
1
     through U, and I believe that we're in agreement that those
 2
     will be admissible for purposes of the proceeding today.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay.
 4
               MR. HOLLEY: Is that --
 5
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Your Honor, they are admissible
     as part of the deposition, and they are the exhibits that
 6
 7
     he's identified. I reserve my right to object to the
 8
     admissibility --
 9
               THE COURT RECORDER: Counsel, I'm sorry.
10
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- of --
11
               THE COURT RECORDER: Could you speak up just a
12
     little bit?
13
               MR. SCHWARTZER: I --
14
               THE COURT RECORDER: Thank you.
15
               MR. SCHWARTZER: I reserve my right to object to
16
     the admissibility based upon items like hearsay and things
17
     like that to the contents of any of the exhibits.
18
               THE COURT: Okay.
19
               MR. HOLLEY: And I'm not quite sure where that
20
     puts us, your Honor, because in the deposition we did
2.1
     discuss this. Had I known that, perhaps, I would have
22
     needed to bring Mr. Bunch down. It would be --
23
               THE COURT: Well, let's --
24
               MR. HOLLEY: My understanding --
25
               THE COURT: -- just go --
```

```
1
               MR. HOLLEY: -- of our arrangement --
 2
                THE COURT: -- because most --
 3
                MR. HOLLEY: -- was that --
                THE COURT: -- of these are --
 4
                MR. HOLLEY: -- was not --
 5
 6
                THE COURT: -- legal issues, so --
 7
                MR. HOLLEY: I think that they are, your Honor,
 8
     and we'll go ahead and proceed and allow the Court to issue
 9
     its ruling.
10
          Again, in terms of setting the table here just a little
11
     bit, your Honor, the Bunches have the largest as I
12
     understand it unsecured claim in the Commercial Mortgage
13
     bankruptcy case based upon a timely-filed proof of claim on
14
     November 8. The amount of the claim is approximately
15
     8,000,000 and change.
16
           They were part of class A-4. The debtors solicited a
17
     ballot from the Bunches as part of the plan-confirmation
18
     process. When the ballot was cast against confirmation of
19
     the plan, an objection ensued afterwards.
20
           The objection was filed on November 11th, was mailed to
2.1
     the Bunches on November 12th, and then it was received I
2.2
     believe on November 13th, your Honor. At that point, we
23
     immediately proceeded to file a motion for allowance of the
24
     claim.
25
           I don't believe that we have factual disputes before
```

2.1

```
the Court, and, therefore, I agree with the Court that I believe it's really a question concerning legal interpretation of Section 502(d).
```

It's my understanding that there's not an issue about the fact that the Bunches loaned \$10,000,000 to the debtors over a four-year period in 27 installments. If I'm mistaken on any of these things, hopefully, Mr. Schwartzer will let me know.

The last installment was made in February of 2004. According to the terms of the promissory note, the promissory note would then mature one year after the last installment taking you up to a \$10,000,000 loan amount arrived, so that unless otherwise modified the maturity date would be in February of 2005.

Mr. Bunch testified during his examination yesterday that at or about February of 2005 he agreed to -- rather than to accelerate the outstanding indebtedness that was owing, he agreed to extend the note for an additional year provided, however, that the default or late charge was assessed which was five percent of the outstanding balance -- that's approximately \$500,000 -- and that the default rate of interest at 24 percent would accrue on the obligation for that one-year extension period.

Mr. Bunch also testified that on or about February of 2006 that again the note was modified to -- not accelerated,

2.1

2.2

but allowed to proceed out for another year period again provided that there was an assessment of another five-percent late charge on the outstanding balance, and that interest would continue to accrue at the default rate of 24 percent.

I believe Mr. Bunch also testified that he received regular monthly payments according to the terms of the note since July of 2002.

Among the exhibits that have submitted to the Court, your Honor, are copies of bank statements from July of 2002 forward through March of 2006.

And what those bank statements indicate is that there were payments made again on the regular basis over that period of approximately five years under the terms of the promissory note on or about the 10th of each month.

Mr. Bunch testified that the first few payments back in 2000 were made by deposit slips, you know, deposits being put into the account, but, thereafter, the payments were simply forwarded by ACH or electronic transfers to Mr. Bunch's account.

And, again, one of the exhibits that is before the Court are the bank statements evidencing receipt of those payments.

The issue I believe today, your Honor, in terms of whether their claim should be allowed for voting purposes or

```
1
     not is based upon Section 502(d).
 2
          As I understand it, the debtors are contending that the
 3
     payment made of approximately $217,000 in January 2006 --
 4
     I'm sorry -- February of 2006 and a payment in the amount of
 5
     196,000 --
 6
                THE COURT: D or B, you mean?
 7
                MR. HOLLEY: D as in David, your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: Oh. Did you 547 or 502?
 9
               MR. HOLLEY: 502 --
10
                THE COURT: Oh.
11
               MR. HOLLEY: -- (d).
12
                THE COURT: 502. Okay.
13
               MR. HOLLEY: Yes. On the basis --
14
                THE COURT: Yes. Okay.
15
                MR. HOLLEY: -- that there is an alleged avoidable
16
     transfer sitting out there, and that until that is repaid
17
     the claim is disallowed.
18
          And, again, the two particular payments that I believe
19
     are the subject of the objection, the objection to the claim
20
     as well as the objection to the motion, are those two
2.1
     payments that I just referenced for the Court totalling
     400-and-some-odd-thousand dollars and change which,
2.2
23
     coincidentally, is about .036 percent of the outstanding
24
     claim of the Bunches in the bankruptcy case.
25
           There are, your Honor, several points that we would
```

```
1
      like to make in terms of our argument. I hope the Court
 2
     received our --
 3
                THE COURT: I did.
               MR. HOLLEY: -- reply. Again, I apologize for the
 4
 5
      lateness, but --
 6
                THE COURT: Well, I understand because of the
 7
      shortness of all the claims.
 8
               MR. HOLLEY: It --
 9
                THE COURT: And I --
10
               MR. HOLLEY: It --
                THE COURT: I did get a chance to read it.
11
12
                MR. HOLLEY: Exactly. Thank you, your Honor.
13
     Your Honor, in terms of whether the payments were made in
14
     the ordinary course of business under 547(c)(2), there's a
15
     statement made in the objection that was filed this morning
16
     by Mr. Schwartzer that we have not presented any evidence in
17
     support of that position, but we beg to differ, your Honor.
18
          And, again, what we would refer the Court to are those
19
     bank statements from 2000 through March of 2006 showing that
20
     payments were made in the ordinary course on or about the
     10th of each month for a very, very long period in time.
2.1
22
           It may be pointed out that while notwithstanding even
23
     to the extent you could demonstrate that it was some sort of
24
     ordinary course between the debtors the industry standard
25
     may not have been met.
```

```
1
          And, admittedly, your Honor, given the very, very short
 2
     amount of time that we've had in this case, we have not been
 3
     able to retain an expert and get a report prepared and
 4
      submitted to the Court.
 5
          But as Mr. Bunch testified in his 2004 examination, he
 6
     has extensive experience in the industry and did not find
 7
     the transaction to be outside of the ordinary course in
 8
     terms --
 9
                THE COURT: But --
10
               MR. HOLLEY: -- of --
                THE COURT: But how would --
11
12
                MR. HOLLEY: -- the industry itself.
13
                THE COURT: -- a mortgage-servicing company and --
14
     well, I'm sorry. Was it made -- the loan was made to which
15
     entity, USCAM (sic)?
16
                MR. HOLLEY: Yes.
                THE COURT: Okay. How is lending money to a
17
18
     mortgage-servicing company on one hand and the reverse side
19
     borrowing money from a private investor, a private person?
20
     How is that in the ordinary course of a servicing business?
                MR. HOLLEY: Well, your Honor, again, I can refer
2.1
22
     to Mr. Bunch's deposition testimony where he was involved in
23
     this type of business himself for a period of time.
24
     originally was in the construction-development business and
25
     then moved over and started doing loans.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

```
And Mr. Bunch testified that in his experience it's not
an unusual arrangement. And, second of all, from his
perspective, he had reviewed financial statements and
audited financial statements that had been provided to him.
     And these were consolidated financial statements for
the entities and believed that based upon those there was
sufficient financial strength to repay the obligations, and
that the money would be used, you know, really within the
discretion of the borrowing entity.
     So in terms of his position, your Honor, again, we
don't have an expert before the Court. But in terms of his
testimony based upon his experience, it's not something that
is outside of the ordinary course of business, certainly,
not of this debtor as we can see since this loan has been
outstanding since approximately July of 2000 and not unusual
within the industry itself.
     Another argument that is raised --
          THE COURT: And did he --
          MR. HOLLEY: -- in terms of --
          THE COURT: -- make loans to other mortgage
companies or to other businesses?
          MR. HOLLEY: He testified that he does have loans
outstanding to other mortgage companies and businesses,
vour Honor --
```

MR. SCHWARTZER: Your Honor --

```
1
               MR. HOLLEY: -- yes.
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- I object to that
 2
 3
     characterization of the testimony. I believe he -- and I
 4
     would -- Mr. Holley invited me to object when he's arguing
 5
     if I disagree to any points.
 6
           I don't think Mr. Bunch's testimony was either that he
 7
     made loans to other mortgage companies. He said he made
 8
     other mortgage loans, number one.
 9
          And, number two, he never said anything about this
10
     being in the ordinary course of the mortgage business
11
     because he himself has been a lender, and he's gone and made
12
     loans to other mortgage companies, but he never said he made
13
     a loan to another mortgage company, and we have the
14
     transcript here about it.
15
           I think if Mr. Holley is going to say that there was
16
     testimony that this was in the ordinary course of the
17
     debtor's business I would like to have him point to the
18
     specific page and line of the transcript where that was said
     because that's not --
19
20
                THE COURT: Okay.
2.1
                MR. SCHWARTZER: -- my recollection, your Honor.
2.2
                MR. HOLLEY: Okay. I appreciate that, your Honor.
23
     I don't think he used the words "ordinary course of
24
     business".
25
          What he did say is that these loans were outstanding
```

```
1
     from July of 2000 to present, that the payments were made in
 2
     the ordinary course according to the terms of those notes,
 3
     of the promissory note. We submitted the bank statements
 4
     which demonstrate that that was the case. In terms of --
 5
               THE COURT: You know, if --
 6
               MR. HOLLEY: -- industry practice --
 7
               THE COURT: Let me interrupt you here because I'm
 8
     thinking maybe what we should do is recess this argument to
 9
     give you more time to supplement the brief with specific
10
     references and quotes in the transcript --
               MR. HOLLEY: I would appreciate that.
11
12
                THE COURT: -- that support the elements of what
13
     you're claiming.
14
               MR. HOLLEY: I appreciate that, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: And that would help me, rather than
16
     making me read --
17
               MR. HOLLEY: Yes.
18
               THE COURT: -- the whole transcript and rather
19
     than making you guess about what was said because you just
20
     had it.
2.1
          And I certainly appreciate the fact -- you know, on one
     hand, the debtor probably shouldn't have waited as long to
22
23
     object as they did. Can they not do that? Well, there's
24
     nothing that says they can't do it, so --
25
               MR. HOLLEY: It is, you know, and I did think
```

```
1
     about that, your Honor. It seemed, well, from my -- well,
 2
     anyway.
 3
                THE COURT: Yeah. And the harm I guess has been
 4
     remedied by the fact that I am hearing you on shortened
 5
     time.
 6
           (Colloquy not on the record.)
 7
                THE COURT:
                            There's nothing in the code that
 8
     prevents it, and it's too bad. There probably should be a
 9
     rule that says you've got to do it in a certain time, but
10
     there isn't.
11
               MR. HOLLEY: I --
12
                THE COURT: So they --
13
               MR. HOLLEY: I --
14
               THE COURT: -- didn't do anything --
15
               MR. HOLLEY: I agree with that, and I --
16
                THE COURT: -- outside --
               MR. HOLLEY: I do --
17
18
                THE COURT: -- the rules.
19
               MR. HOLLEY: And I do appreciate that, your Honor.
20
     It would be helpful for us to be able to review the
2.1
     transcript and to cite to it, so I would like to do that,
2.2
     and I appreciate the opportunity --
23
                THE COURT: And let me tell you --
24
               MR. HOLLEY: -- to do so.
25
                THE COURT: -- what my thinking is now on 502(d).
```

```
1
               MR. HOLLEY: Okay.
 2
                THE COURT:
                            And I have read your arguments, but I
 3
     was thinking about this before in connection with --
 4
                MR. SCHWARTZER: The Kehl people?
 5
                THE COURT: -- the settlement issue in the other
 6
     case we had. I read 502(d) to say exactly what it says, and
 7
     it may seem totally unfair.
 8
          But it seems to me that even if it's $2 the whole claim
 9
     is disallowed. Well, let me get to 502(d), 502, so I'm
10
     reading the exact one.
11
           "Notwithstanding A and B which says a claim is deemed
12
     allowed, the Court shall disallow any claim of any entity
13
     from which properties are recoverable or the transferee of a
14
     transfer avoidable under 547 unless they have paid the
15
     amount or turned over the property."
16
           So it seems to me that under the code that unless, you
     know, you turn over that amount -- and I assume it could be
17
18
     held in escrow. I mean, maybe that's one way around it --
19
     you don't get a vote on anything.
20
           I know it seems unfair. I know it seems like you said
2.1
     one should just net. But, of course, the other rationale is
2.2
     we're just talking about voting purposes. We're not talking
23
     about estimation even here. We're talking about voting
24
     purposes.
```

And on one hand, the code's rationale -- but it doesn't

25

make any difference. We've got plain language here. The rationale would be we don't want somebody voting when they wouldn't even get anything until they've turned the money over, so I'm reading the plain language.

MR. HOLLEY: Right.

2.1

THE COURT: So where we are now is was there, arguably, more likely rather than less likely there was a preference under the code.

MR. HOLLEY: I understand that, your Honor. And as the Court saw in our hastily-prepared papers, in terms of addressing the point that the Court is raising, that, you know, the Western District of Arkansas case which is kind around the same era -- and, granted, Arkansas is not as large as Texas.

But, nevertheless, I think that under the circumstances we have in this case it seemed particularly applicable and appropriate in that I know there's nothing in the rules that defines when you can object to a claim versus not.

But it does seem -- it did strike me as being peculiar, your Honor, that a debtor or a plan proponent could go out and actually solicit a ballot from a creditor who doesn't have a contingent or unliquidated claim, but one that is certain -- and the proof of claim itself attaches, you know, the detail of how the amounts were arrived at -- to invite a vote with respect to a pending plan, receive the ballot, and

```
1
     then they make a determination that, oh, wait a second, we
 2
      don't like the ballot and then disenfranchise the creditor
 3
      whose vote, in fact, was solicited immediately beforehand,
 4
      and --
 5
                THE COURT: I think, unfortunately, it only rises
     to the level of tacky if you will as opposed to --
 6
 7
                MR. HOLLEY: We used the word "shameful".
 8
                THE COURT: -- illegal --
 9
                MR. HOLLEY: But, you know, tacky's okay.
10
                THE COURT: -- as opposed --
11
               MR. HOLLEY: But --
12
                THE COURT: -- to --
13
                MR. HOLLEY: But --
14
                THE COURT: -- illegal in the sense of against the
15
      code --
16
                MR. HOLLEY: Yes.
17
                THE COURT: -- or the rules --
18
               MR. HOLLEY: And --
19
                THE COURT: -- especially --
20
                MR. HOLLEY: And we --
21
                THE COURT: -- since there's been the opportunity,
22
     now, you know, if you hadn't had the chance to even have
23
     your motion, but I --
2.4
                MR. HOLLEY: Yes.
25
                THE COURT: I --
```

```
1
               MR. HOLLEY: And --
                THE COURT: I don't see anything --
 2
 3
               MR. HOLLEY: And I --
                THE COURT: -- in the code that precludes it.
 4
 5
     I --
 6
               MR. HOLLEY: Right. And I appreciate the Court --
 7
                THE COURT: And I --
 8
                MR. HOLLEY: -- kind of entertaining this debate
 9
     back and forth because, I mean, we're familiar with the
10
     Texas cases.
11
          We were actually rather surprised in doing our research
12
     that there weren't more cases out there across the country
13
     that addressed, you know, these particular issues because it
14
     seems at some point in time these things would have arisen
15
     with some regularity in various cases. But be that as it
16
     may, we are aware of the authorities that are out there.
17
          And so I think our position is concisely set forth in
18
     the (indiscernible) in the initial motion, and I understand
19
     the Court's reading of 502(d), and, again, we're talking
20
     about voting purposes.
2.1
                THE COURT: So just focus --
2.2
               MR. HOLLEY: And so --
23
                THE COURT: -- on your supplement under whether or
24
     not that's a preference.
25
               MR. HOLLEY: Yes.
```

```
1
                THE COURT: And, of course, we have the new added
 2
     wrinkle because we have the revised preference provisions.
 3
     Now, of course --
 4
               MR. HOLLEY: Yes.
                THE COURT: -- it's the same elements, so you just
 5
     don't have to do both.
 6
 7
                MR. HOLLEY: Right.
 8
                THE COURT: So that's why I would appreciate kind
 9
     of focusing on this and then focus me in on your evidence as
10
     well.
11
          I'll leave it to you on your briefing and how you want
12
     to do this. I don't particularly want to do this next week.
13
     If you want to do it next week, you can. Or in the
14
     alternative, I see no reason -- well, you know, you got the
15
     confirmation, but the point is --
16
                MR. SCHWARTZER: Your --
17
                THE COURT: -- maybe --
18
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Your Honor --
19
                THE COURT: -- you want to wait and see what
20
     happens with confirmation. Maybe you want to wait and see
2.1
     if there's an appeal.
2.2
                MR. HOLLEY: Now, from my perspective, that does
23
     make some sense. I understand the issues that the debtors
24
     are trying to deal with in terms of class A-5 and whether
25
     they should be a class or not and whether they're impaired
```

```
1
     and not.
 2
          But it does seem to me, your Honor, that if an appeal
 3
     is not timely filed to that particular issue -- my
 4
     understanding is the Court confirmed the plan on the
 5
     cramdown standard --
 6
                THE COURT: Right.
 7
                MR. HOLLEY: -- assuming that there was not a
 8
     consenting --
 9
                THE COURT: I did assume --
10
               MR. HOLLEY: -- A-4.
11
                THE COURT: -- for purposes of the record.
12
                MR. HOLLEY: Yes. And so that makes some sense to
13
     me, so that we're not out here spinning our wheels.
14
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Well, your Honor, on the other
15
     hand, we are quite sure there will be an appeal, and it
16
     would eliminate -- basically, if the motion is denied
17
     because of the preferential transfers, and the Bunch vote
18
     doesn't count, then class A-4 has voted to accept the plan,
     and it will eliminate a whole series of issues on the
19
20
     appeal, so we would like to have this Court issue either an
2.1
     order --
2.2
                THE COURT: Well, I will issue --
23
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- (indiscernible) to --
24
                THE COURT: -- an order. The question is the
25
     timing.
```

```
1
               MR. SCHWARTZER: The question -- we would like to
2
     have it heard and issued within the ten days for the appeal.
 3
               THE COURT: But the reality is the ten days
 4
     expires. You've got to get your transcript. You do your
 5
     issues on appeal. You wouldn't have to do any briefing.
 6
               MR. SCHWARTZER: I understand. You're right,
 7
     your Honor, but part of the problem if it's included in --
 8
     and, particularly, for example, if you were saying what
 9
     Mr. Holley has to do is now just point out the lines in the
10
     transcript which could be done in a day, so you don't have
11
     to read the whole transcript, and we had the hearing on
12
     Monday or Tuesday because that's what -- really, we have a
13
      (indiscernible). Did his client prove that this was in the
14
     ordinary course --
15
               THE COURT: Well, I'm not particularly --
16
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- of the --
17
               THE COURT: -- excited --
18
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- mortgage business.
19
               THE COURT: -- about adding something --
20
               MR. HOLLEY: And --
2.1
               THE COURT: -- to next week's calendar --
2.2
               MR. SCHWARTZER: I --
23
               MR. HOLLEY: And I think --
24
               MR. SCHWARTZER: I --
25
               THE COURT: -- quite frankly.
```

```
1
               MR. HOLLEY: And I think --
 2
               MR. SCHWARTZER: I --
 3
               MR. HOLLEY: I think --
 4
               MR. SCHWARTZER: I understand, but --
 5
               MR. HOLLEY: -- I'm busy next Monday, your Honor,
 6
     on --
 7
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Tuesday.
 8
               MR. HOLLEY: -- December 25th.
 9
               THE COURT: You know, we've got a hearing date --
10
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Tuesday.
               MR. HOLLEY: And I don't want --
11
12
               THE COURT: -- for the 3rd.
13
               MR. HOLLEY: -- to spend all of the holidays
14
     dealing with this myself.
15
               MR. SCHWARTZER: The 3rd would be fine,
16
     your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Does the 3rd work for you?
18
               MR. HOLLEY: Oh, January 3rd? Yes.
19
               THE COURT: In other words, if you get me
20
     something by next -- wait a minute. I need a calendar.
2.1
               MR. HOLLEY: Like Thursday-ish?
22
               THE COURT: Hold on. They won't let us have paper
23
     calendars, anymore, so I can -- here we go. Okay. The 3rd
24
     -- oh, the 3rd is Wednesday, ooh.
25
               MR. SCHWARTZER: So if we got --
```

```
1
               THE COURT: If you could give me something by
 2
     Thursday at noon?
 3
               MR. HOLLEY: I think I can do that, your Honor.
 4
               MR. SCHWARTZER: And any response I would want
 5
     would have to be filed by Friday at 5:00 o'clock?
 6
               THE COURT: Yeah. Because I can just upload it
 7
     and read it --
 8
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Because it will be short --
 9
               THE COURT: -- when it's uploaded.
10
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- if there's anything.
11
               THE COURT: And then a worst-case basis I could
12
     put you on the 4th or the 5th.
13
               THE CLERK: What day, the 3rd?
14
               THE COURT: The 3rd's a USA day.
15
               THE CLERK: Yes.
               MR. SCHWARTZER: It is --
16
17
               THE COURT: No. The question is poor Mr. Holley
18
     doesn't want to sit through a whole day of that.
19
               MR. HOLLEY: Well, if it's all the same,
20
     your Honor, I would prefer not to.
2.1
                THE COURT: All right. Why don't we put you on
22
     the -- you're here --
23
               MR. SCHWARTZER: How about --
24
               THE COURT: -- all the time --
25
               MR. HOLLEY: You could --
```

```
1
               MR. SCHWARTZER: How about if --
 2
               MR. HOLLEY: -- put us --
 3
                THE COURT: -- anyway --
 4
               MR. HOLLEY: -- at the beginning --
 5
                THE COURT: -- Mr. Schwartzer.
 6
               MR. HOLLEY: -- of the calendar, too --
 7
               MR. SCHWARTZER: How about at 1:30 --
 8
                MR. HOLLEY: -- (indiscernible).
 9
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- on the 3rd if you have the
10
     whole day set aside, your Honor?
11
                THE COURT: And it won't take all day for all
12
     these things? I haven't had the chance --
13
                MR. HOLLEY: Will it?
14
               THE COURT: -- to look at this calendar, yet.
15
               MR. SCHWARTZER: No.
                THE COURT: Oh, you've got that procedures motion.
16
               MR. SCHWARTZER: H'mm?
17
18
               MR. HOLLEY: I'm here for that as well,
19
     your Honor.
20
                THE COURT: Oh, you're here for the procedure?
2.1
     Oh, that's right because you represent those other people.
2.2
     Well, you're going to be stuck here, anyway, so --
23
               MR. SCHWARTZER: And I'm --
24
               MR. HOLLEY: Not that I don't welcome the
25
     opportunity to associate with Mr. Schwartzer.
```

```
1
                THE COURT: So, yeah, we'll put it on the 9:30
2
     calendar understanding -- well, I don't have a problem with
 3
     taking -- that will be taken after everybody else leaves if
 4
     you're stuck -- if you're going to be here on that
 5
     procedures motion, anyway.
 6
               MR. HOLLEY: I am here for that, your Honor.
 7
                MR. SCHWARTZER: And somebody from office will be
 8
     here, anyway, so --
 9
                THE COURT: Okay.
10
               MR. HOLLEY: And so this is January 3rd, then, at
     9:30, your Honor?
11
12
                THE COURT: Right.
13
               MR. HOLLEY: And since --
14
                THE COURT: Now, we'll take the other matters
15
     first, so it's not quite --
16
                MR. HOLLEY: Right.
17
                THE COURT: -- 9:30.
18
               MR. HOLLEY: But --
19
                THE COURT: But --
20
               MR. HOLLEY: Since the Court brought up the
2.1
     procedures motion, can I ask a question? Do you intend that
2.2
     to be an evidentiary hearing or just oral argument
23
     regarding --
24
                THE COURT: I hadn't thought --
25
               MR. HOLLEY: -- the presentation?
```

```
1
               THE COURT: -- it through. If the parties think I
 2
     need evidence, then -- do you think we need evidence or can
 3
     we just do it --
 4
               MR. HOLLEY: I --
 5
               THE COURT: -- on declarations?
               MR. HOLLEY: I don't. I don't think we do.
 6
 7
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Your Honor, we --
 8
               MR. HOLLEY: But --
 9
               MR. SCHWARTZER: We don't think it's an
10
     evidentiary hearing, either.
11
               THE COURT: Okay.
12
               MR. SCHWARTZER: We think it's argument based upon
13
     declarations.
14
               THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Fine. All right.
                                                            So
15
     what we'll do is Mr. Holley's designation will be Thursday
16
     at noon, Mr. Schwartzer Friday by 5:00, and then we'll just
17
     have argument on it on the 3rd with the USA day.
18
               MR. SCHWARTZER: Okay. No --
19
               THE COURT: And that will give me a chance --
20
               MR. SCHWARTZER: You understand --
2.1
               THE COURT: -- to read the transcript.
2.2
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- my --
23
               THE COURT: I'll skim through the transcript in
24
     the meantime, but --
25
               MR. SCHWARTZER: You understand my staff is going
```

```
1
     to appreciate the fact that you said by 5:00 p.m., rather
 2
     than on Friday because --
 3
                THE COURT: Right.
 4
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- we know that it would be done
 5
     between 11:00 and midnight because I would have the
 6
     assistance of my co-counsel from Ray, Quinney, & Nebeker who
 7
     would insist upon filing it no sooner than 11:58. We've
 8
     worked this out with them that we never get anything before
 9
     11:00 p.m. for filing.
10
               THE COURT: Okay.
11
               MR. HOLLEY: And we're talking Pacific time,
12
     right, your Honor?
13
                THE COURT: That's right.
14
               MR. HOLLEY: I just --
15
                THE COURT: Pacific time.
               MR. HOLLEY: I just want to make sure --
16
17
               MR. SCHWARTZER:
                                Oh.
18
               MR. HOLLEY: -- we're in the same ballpark here.
19
                MR. SCHWARTZER: Thank you, your Honor, for making
20
     that clear because --
                THE COURT: Oh, that's right because they're on
2.1
2.2
     Mountain time.
23
               MR. SCHWARTZER: No. They're on Hawaiian time --
24
                THE COURT: Right.
25
               MR. SCHWARTZER: -- apparently.
```

```
1
                THE COURT: Yeah. Will that give me -- well, hey,
 2
      if I don't have a chance to read it, and I'm not ready to
 3
      rule, then the point is I'll just take it under submission.
 4
                MR. HOLLEY: Right.
 5
                MR. SCHWARTZER: Right.
 6
                THE COURT: Okay.
 7
                MR. SCHWARTZER: Thank you, your Honor.
 8
                MR. HOLLEY: Okay.
 9
                THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
10
                MR. HOLLEY: Thank you.
11
                THE COURT: Happy holidays everybody.
12
                MR. HOLLEY: You too, your Honor.
13
                THE COURT: I hope this is the last I see you
14
     before the holidays.
15
           (Colloquy not on the record.)
16
                THE CLERK: All rise.
17
           (Court concluded at 02:19:27 p.m.)
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
2.4
25
```

```
I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
 1
      from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in
 2
 3
      the above-entitled matter.
 4
 5
 6
      /s/ Lisa L. Cline
                                                          03/14/07
     Lisa L. Cline, Transcriptionist
 7
                                                           Date
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```